



State of Utah

DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

INSPECTION REPORT

Norman H. Bangerter Dee C. Hansen **Executive Director** Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.

Division Director

355 West North Temple 3 Triad Center, Suite 350 Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203 801-538-5340

Partial:_ Complete:___ Exploration: X Inspection Date & Time: 10/15/92, 13:00 -16:30

Date of Last Inspection: 9/23/92

| Mine Name: Skyline Mine County: Carbon Permit Number: ACT/007/005 | |
|--|-----|
| Permittee and/or Operator's Name: Coastal States Energy/Utah Fuel Co. Pusings Address: P.O. Box 710: Helper UT, 84527, (801) 637-7025 | 1 C |
| Business Address: P.O. Box 719; Helper UT 84527. (801) 637-7925 | 4 U |
| Type of Mining Activity: Underground X Surface Prep. Plant Other Other | |
| State Officials(s): Priscilla Burton | |
| Company Official(s): Mark Bunnell | |
| Federal Official(s): Tom Rassmussen & Gary Johnson (BLM, Price); | |
| Walt Novak & Jeff Defries, (USFS, Manti La Sal) | |
| Weather Conditions: clear, mild | |
| Existing Acreage: Permitted-7067.11 Disturbed-62.08 Regraded- Seeded- Bonded-62.41 | |
| Increased/Decreased: Permitted Disturbed Regraded Bonded | |
| Status:Exploration/_X_Active/Inactive/Temporary Cessation/Bond Forfeiture | |
| Reclamation (Phase I/Phase II/Final Bond Release/LiabilityYear) | |
| REVIEW OF PERMIT, PERFORMANCE STANDARDS & PERMIT CONDITION REQUIREMENTS | |

Instructions

- Substantiate the elements on this inspection by checking the appropriate performance standard.
 - For complete inspections provide narrative justification for any elements not fully inspected unless element is not appropriate to the site, in which case check N/A.
 - For partial inspections check only the elements evaluated.
- Document any noncompliance situation by referencing the NOV issued at the appropriate performance standard listed below. 2.
- Reference any narratives written in conjunction with this inspection at the appropriate performance standard listed below.
- Provide a brief status report for all pending enforcement actions, permit conditions, Division Orders, and amendments.

| | | | EVALUATED | N/A | COMMENTS | NOV/ENF | |
|-------------|-----|---|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--|
| | 1. | PERMITS, CHANGE, TRANSFER, RENEWAL, SALE | | $\overline{\Box}$ | [x] | | |
| : | 2. | SIGNS AND MARKERS | <u>[x]</u> | $\overline{\Box}$ | | $\overline{\square}$ | |
| | 3. | TOPSOIL | | $\overline{\Box}$ | | \Box | |
| | 4. | HYDROLOGIC BALANCE: | | | | | |
| | a. | DIVERSIONS | \Box | | \Box | | |
| * | b | . SEDIMENT PONDS AND IMPOUNDMENTS | | | \Box | <u> </u> | |
| | c. | OTHER SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES | | | | \Box | |
| | d. | . WATER MONITORING | | \Box | [x] | \Box | |
| | e. | EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS | | | | Ш | |
| | | EXPLOSIVES | | | | Ĺ | |
| ٨ (| 6. | DISPOSAL OF EXCESS SPOIL/FILLS/BENCHES | | \Box | | | |
| | 7. | | S [] | | | Щ | |
| / | 8. | NONCOAL WASTE | | \Box | | | |
| 9 | 9. | PROTECTION OF FISH, WILDLIFE AND | | | | | |
| | | RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL VALUES | | Щ | | ĻĻ | |
| 1 (| | SLIDES AND OTHER DAMAGE | | \Box | | Щ | |
| 11 | | CONTEMPORANEOUS RECLAMATION | <u>[x]</u> | Ц | [x] | لِـاِ | |
| * 12 | | BACKFILLING AND GRADING | | | Щ | ĻĻ | |
| 13 | | REVEGETATION | <u>[x]</u> | | Ц | ĻĻ | |
| × 14 | | SUBSIDENCE CONTROL | Щ | Щ | Ц | ĻĻ | |
| 15 | | CESSATION OF OPERATIONS | | | \Box | Ш | |
| 16 | 5. | ROADS: | | | | e 3 | |
| × | a. | | Щ | لِـلِ | Ļ | 닏 | |
| | b. | | Ļļ | Ļļ | H | Ļ | |
| 17 | • | OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES | ĻĻ | Ļļ | Ļļ | 닏 | |
| 18 | · . | SUPPORT FACILITIES/UTILITY INSTALLATIONS | Ļ | لِـلِ | ٻــاِ | Ц | |
| 19 |) _ | AVS CHECK (4th Quarter-April, May, June) (d | late) [] | 1 1 | | Li | |

INSPECTION REPORT

| (Continuation sheet) | | | Page | _2_ of _3_ | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|------|------------|--|--|
| PERMIT NUMBER: ACT/007/005 | DATE OF INSPECTION: 10/15/92 | | | | | |
| 20. AIR QUALITY PERMIT 21. BONDING & INSURANCE | | | | | | |

(Comments are numbered to correspond to those items listed above)

1. Permits

The purpose of the inspection was to evaluate the drill holes completed in Woods Canyon in the Fall of 1991 under BLM Exploration Permit UTU-68087 (9/18/91). This exploration permit was for three drill holes. Two of the three were completed as piezometers and designated 91-26-1 (Granger Ridge) and 91-35-1 (Winter Quarters Ridge). These sites were inspected in the Fall of 1991 by Randy Harden and Rick Summers of the Division. At that time, however, reclamation of the sites had not occurred.

As a courtesy, the Forest Service and BLM were invited along on the inspection, as the BLM is the issuing Agency and Woods Canyon lies within the Manti La Sal Forest. Tom Rassmussen and Gary Johnson (BLM) met with us at the mine site, but did not accompany us to the field. Manti La Sal National Forest representatives were Walt Novak and Jeff Defries. Mark Bunnell represented Utah Fuel Co.

At the outset of the meeting, there was some discussion about DOGM's role in the inspection of Off-Permit explorations. Mr. Novak asserted (and the BLM officials concurred) that DOGM has not in the past conducted these inspections. Mr. Rassmussen stated that he had been present during the drilling, casing, and sealing of the well sites. Mr. Novak stated that Forest representatives had inspected the site during reclamation activities in the Fall of 1991 and as a general rule would not inspect the site again until three growing seasons had passed.

The Woods Canyon Exploration amendment was submitted to the Division and given the Amendment number ACT/007/005/91A on June 14, 1991. Forest Service stipulations for the drilling were received by the Division on 9/3/91.

4.d. Water Monitoring

The site is not located in the permit area. The holes have not been given a water monitoring designation at this time. Mr. Bunnell indicated that

- 1. the holes were approximately 2000' deep;
- 2. the aquifer being monitored was the Starpoint;
- 3. water was noted at approximately 1350' to 1500' depth in both monitoring locations.

No further information was available at the time of the inspection. No drill logs were viewed.

11. Contemporaneous Reclamation

Drill Site 91-26-1

This site is located adjacent to a well-graded road on the Granger Ridge in an Aspen/grass ecosystem. The area was fenced with a "let-down" fence. The pad was level. The soils were dark brown in color. Large aspen trees were strewn about the site. Rocks protected the drill hole from vehicles. A Cover of grasses has established on the site, although they have been grazed by sheep. (Mr. Bunnell stated that the fence had been let down only three days before.) Few seed heads were apparent and identification was difficult. However, Timothy and Slender wheatgrass seedheads were visible. A mustard-type weed was prevalent. No shrubs were included in the mix. None were present on the site.

INSPECTION REPORT

(Continuation sheet)

Page <u>3</u> of <u>3</u>

PERMIT NUMBER: ACT/007/005

DATE OF INSPECTION: 10/15/92

Drill Site 91-26-1, cont.d

The casing was locked and identified. Mr. Bunnell stated that the casing was sealed with cement below ground level and that topsoil had been placed over the seal, right up to the contact with the locked cap.

Mr. Novak was very pleased with the reclamation progress on this site.

Drill Site 91-35-1

This site is located on a ridge top. A road to the drill site was blazed through the Aspen/Spruce community on the ridge top for a distance of 3/4 mile. Reclamation of this road consisted of a heavy scattering of aspen, disturbing the aspen rootball and seeding. Grazing would have been very difficult on this road pad. Yet, the grasses were not tall, lush or in seed.

The drill site was fenced with a let-down fence and is approximately level. Mr. Bunnell stated that he had found the fence down in one section, when he last inspected the site. Sheep sign was evident over the site. The soils are rocky and lime colored. Aspen trees had been scattered around the site. Grasses, penstamen and yarrow were noted on the site. No grass heads were available for identification. Adjacent to the site, sagebrush and mountain mahogany were viewed on the south and gooseberry current was visible on the north slope. No shrubs were seen on the site and none were planted. The drill hole was sealed with a locked cap and identified. The cement seal on this hole was also covered with soil.

Mr. Novak was pleased with the reclamation on this site as well.

Drill Site 91-35-2

This hole was not drilled.

Copy of this Report:

Mailed to: Bernie Freeman (OSM), Mark Bunnell (Utah Fuel Co.)

Given to: Joe Helfrich and Daron Haddock (DOGM)

Inspector's Signature:

37 Date: 10/16/92